

PETER D. KEISLER  
Assistant Attorney General

KEVIN V. RYAN  
United States Attorney

ELIZABETH J. SHAPIRO (D.C. Bar No. 418925)  
EDWARD H. WHITE (D.C. Bar No. 468531)  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Room 6110  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
Telephone: (202) 514-5108  
Facsimile: (202) 318-4268  
Email: ned.white@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants Department of Defense  
and United States Central Command

COLLEEN FLYNN (SBN 235281)  
CHRIS FORD (SBN 239376)  
3435 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2900  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
Telephone: (213) 252-9444  
Facsimile: (213) 252-0091  
Email: colleen\_ucsc@hotmail.com

W. GORDON KAUPP (SBN 226141)  
115 ½ Bartlett Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
Telephone: (415) 285-8091  
Facsimile: (415) 285-8092  
Email: gordonk@hotmail.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Marguerite Hiken  
and the Military Law Task Force

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MARGUERITE HIKEN and  
THE MILITARY LAW TASK FORCE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE and  
UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND

Defendants.

)  
)  
) Case No. CV-06-2812 (MHP)  
)  
) **STIPULATION TO PERMIT**  
) **DEFENDANTS TO FILE A**  
) **SURREPLY AND TO POSTPONE**  
) **HEARING**  
)  
) HEARING ON CROSS MOTIONS FOR  
) SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
) Date: February 26, 2007  
) Time: 2:00 p.m.

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-12, and subject to the Court's approval, defendants Department  
of Defense and United States Central Command ("defendants") and plaintiffs Marguerite Hiken  
and the Military Law Task Force ("plaintiffs") agree and stipulate to allow defendants to file a  
Stipulation to Permit Surreply  
and to Postpone Hearing  
CV-06-2812 (MHP)

1 surreply, not to exceed 20 pages, by March 5, 2007, and to postpone the hearing on cross-  
 2 motions for summary judgment, previously scheduled for February 26, 2007, until March 12,  
 3 2007 or sometime thereafter.  
 4

5 Good cause exists to permit defendants to file a surreply and to postpone the hearing on  
 6 the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment. On February 2, 2007, plaintiffs filed their  
 7 Reply in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Defendants' Reply  
 8 ("Plaintiffs' Reply") (dkt. no. 39), which is 39 pages long and thus exceeds the 15 page limit for  
 9 reply briefs under the Court's Civil Local Rules 7-3(c) and 7-4(b).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs' Reply also raises  
 10 several new arguments that were not previously presented in the parties' cross-motions for  
 11 summary judgment and oppositions thereto.<sup>2</sup>  
 12

13 Courts frequently allow an opposing party to file a surreply to respond to new arguments  
 14 and excessive material raised in a reply brief. See, e.g., Provenz v. Miller, 102 F.3d 1478, 1483  
 15  
 16

---

17  
 18 <sup>1</sup> While the parties and the Court agreed that this case would proceed on cross-motions  
 19 for summary judgment, and that two of the parties' briefs thus would be combined briefs, the  
 20 plaintiff's reply memorandum has always been designated solely as a reply brief – not a reply  
 21 and an opposition – and is thus limited to 15 pages in length. See Order endorsing Joint  
 22 Stipulation and Motion Regarding Submission of Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment (dkt.  
 23 no. 12) (Aug. 29, 2006) (setting schedule for four sets of briefs: (1) Defendants' motion for  
 24 summary judgment, (2) Plaintiffs' opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment and  
 25 cross-motion for summary judgment, (3) Defendant's reply in support of their motion for  
 26 summary judgment and opposition to plaintiffs' cross-motion for summary judgment, and (4)  
 27 *Plaintiffs' reply in support of their cross-motion for summary judgment*) (emphasis added).

28 <sup>2</sup> For example, plaintiffs, for the first time, in their reply challenge the adequacy of  
 29 defendants' search for responsive documents, Plaintiffs' Reply at 11-12; they assert that  
 30 principles of equity should bar defendants' Exemption 2 claims regarding the ROE documents,  
 31 id. at 27-28; and they assert that the ROE documents listed in the Vaughn index, based on their  
 32 dates, likely are not responsive to their requests, id. at 8.

(9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) (finding that “where new evidence is presented in a reply to a motion for summary judgment, the district court should not consider the new evidence without giving the non-movant an opportunity to respond.”) (citation omitted); Beaird v. Seagate Tech. Inc., 145 F.3d 1159, 1164 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) (indicating that to avoid error, district court must either permit surreply or refrain from relying on new material in reply brief); Prapha-Phatana v. Cooper Tire & Rubber Co., 2006 WL 2683629, \*6 (D. Ariz. 2006) (granting defendant’s request to file a lengthier reply due to plaintiff’s filing of brief exceeding page limits); Stevens v. Deluxe Financial Serv., Inc., 199 F. Supp. 2d 1128, 1130 (D. Kan. 2002) (permitting surreply to respond to new arguments presented in reply).

Furthermore, the parties agree that defendants’ surreply should not be due until March 5, 2007 and that the hearing on the parties’ cross-motions for summary judgment should be postponed until March 12, 2007 or sometime thereafter. Defendants are not able to prepare an adequate surreply in sufficient time prior to the hearing currently scheduled for February 26, 2007 due to counsel’s obligations on other cases and previously scheduled vacation plans from February 16 through February 21. The parties’ stipulation, however, would result in only a minor delay for the hearing on the cross-motions for summary judgment.

Accordingly, the parties stipulate and respectfully request that the Court enter an order permitting defendants to file a surreply and postponing the hearing on cross-motions for summary judgment as set forth above.

A proposed order is attached.

Dated: February 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Stipulation to Permit Surreply  
and to Postpone Hearing  
CV-06-2812 (MHP)

PETER D. KEISLER  
Assistant Attorney General

KEVIN V. RYAN  
United States Attorney

/s/ Edward H. White  
ELIZABETH J. SHAPIRO (D.C. Bar No. 418925)  
EDWARD H. WHITE (D.C. Bar No. 468531)  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Room 6110  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
Tel: (202) 514-5108  
Fax: (202) 318-4268  
Email: ned.white@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

/s/ Colleen Flynn  
COLLEEN FLYNN (SBN 235281)  
3435 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2900  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
Tel: (213) 252-9444  
Fax: (213) 252-0091  
Email: [colleen\\_ucsc@hotmail.com](mailto:colleen_ucsc@hotmail.com)

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Stipulation to Permit Surreply  
and to Postpone Hearing  
CV-06-2812 (MHP)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MARGUERITE HIKEN and  
THE MILITARY LAW TASK FORCE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE and  
UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
) Case No. CV-06-2812 (MHP)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
) ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER  
)  
)  
)  
) HEARING ON CROSS-MOTIONS FOR  
) SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
) Date: February 26, 2007  
) Time: 2:00 p.m.

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

Upon consideration of the STIPULATION TO PERMIT DEFENDANTS TO FILE A  
SURREPLY AND TO POSTPONE HEARING, it is hereby

ORDERED that defendants shall be permitted to file a surreply not exceeding 20 pages  
by March 5, 2007, and the hearing on cross-motions for summary judgment previously  
scheduled for February 26, 2007 will instead be heard at 2:00 p.m., March 26, 2007.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2/15/07

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARILYN HALL PATEL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Stipulation to Permit Surreply  
and to Postpone Hearing  
CV-06-2812 (MHP)